

## Attachment D

### PAST PERFORMANCE

#### **PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

When Filled In This Document Is Source Selection Sensitive  
Information LAW FAR 3.104

**A. GENERAL INFORMATION:** Offerors shall forward this Attachment for completion to each contract/reference the offeror wants the government to consider. Offerors shall ensure each respondent submits a completed survey *directly* to the Contracting Officer by the closing date of the RFP. Offerors are encouraged to have respondents submit the information from the Attachment C prior to the closing date of the RFP.

Contractor's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title or Brief Description of Work: \_\_\_\_\_

Contract Number Provided by Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_ Dollar Amount: \_\_\_\_\_

*\*Note: If offeror holds or has held other contracts with your agency/organization in the last 3 years, please complete separate evaluation forms for those contracts as well.*

**B. AGENCY INFORMATION:** Work to be performed: WESTERN AREA POWER  
ADMINISTRATON, SIERRA NEVADA REGION, 114 PARKSHORE DRIVE, FOLSOM, CA 95630

Offeror submitted as:

☐Prime Contractor ☐Sub-Contractor ☐Key Personnel ☐Teaming/Joint Venture ☐Architect/Engineer

#### **C. RESPONDENT INFORMATION (Person who is completing information):**

Name of Respondent: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ FAX Number: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Contractor performed as:

☐Prime Contractor ☐Sub-Contractor ☐Key Personnel ☐Teaming/Joint Venture ☐Architect/Engineer

**D. FAX COMPLETED SURVEY FORM TO :** ATTN: LUCY BOSWELL 916-985-1933 OR EMAIL  
BOSWELL@WAPA.GOV.

**E. PERFROMANCE INFORMATION:** Choose the number on the scale of 1 to 5 that most accurately describes the contractor's performance or situation. *If there was not performance on the project that can be rated us "Not Applicable (N/A)". PLEASE PROVIDE A NARRATIVE EXPLANATION FOR ANY RATINGS OF 1 OR 2.*

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>No Confidence</b>	<b>Little Confidence</b>	<b>Unknown Confidence</b>	<b>Satisfactory Confidence</b>	<b>Significant Confidence</b>	<b>High Confidence</b>
Performance did not meet most contractual requirements. There were serious problems and the contractor's corrective actions were ineffective.	Performance did not meet some contractual requirements. There were problems, some of a serious nature, for which corrective action was only marginally effective.	The record is inconclusive or without comment or the contractor did not perform this effort.	Performance met contract requirements. There were some minor problems and corrective actions taken by the contractor were satisfactory.	Performance met all contract requirements and exceeded <b>some</b> requirements. There were <b>a few minor problems</b> , which the contractor resolved in a timely, effective manner.	Performance met all contract requirements and exceeded <b>many</b> requirements. <b>Problems</b> , if any, were <b>negligible</b> and were resolved in a timely, highly effective manner.

	<b>Technical Expertise and Project Supervision</b>						
<b>1</b>	Contractor provided experienced technical and administrative personnel with the abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	Contractor hired, retained and promptly replaced employees with appropriate technical skills (e.g., IT, engineering, administrative, etc.) and training commensurate with those required for successful project completion.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Home Office/On-Site/Government Interaction</b>						
<b>3</b>	Identified risks/problems as they occurred and offered constructive and/or viable solution/alternatives.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	Contractor was responsive and reasonable to contract changes from the standpoint of timeliness, suggested solutions, and price.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5</b>	Contractor displayed a cooperative attitude with company/government personnel before and after award.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6</b>	Contractor's on-site supervisor displayed initiative to resolve problems on-site.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7</b>	Were there any claims by subcontractors/suppliers for non-payment. If yes, please explain outcome in "Remarks".	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>				
	<b>Product Quality</b>						
<b>8</b>	Contractor's emphasis on delivering a quality product was apparent in day-to-day operations.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>9</b>	Contractor corrected deficiencies in a timely manner.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>10</b>	Contractor maintained a quality workforce and subcontractors, if applicable, through project completion.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Other</b>						
<b>11</b>	Was the contractor ever issued a cure or show cause notice under the referenced contract? If yes, explain outcome in "Remarks".	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>				
<b>12</b>	Would you award another contract to this contractor? If not, explain in "Remarks".	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>				
	<b>OVERALL ASSESSMENT</b>						
<b>13</b>	Overall, on the scale of 1-5, how would you rate the contractor being surveyed.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

[illegible]